

the above applications, the number of applications rejected and the reasons for their rejection. Their grievances were in the majority of cases due to the unsympathetic attitude of the revenue subordinates on whose reports the Tahsildars' decisions were often based. The Member then pointed out that 7 Pulayas applied for the registry of 7 acres of land out of Survey No. 686/11 in the Arakulam *muri*, Karikode *pakuthi*, Todupuzha taluk, entered on the area and improved it, but the land was afterwards registered in the name of another and the Pulayas were turned out of the lands in question. In another case, *ozhugus* for an area of about 160 acres of land, comprised in Survey No. 790/1 in the Rani *pakuthi*, Chengannur taluk, were prepared in the names of 50 Pulayas and they deposited *tharavila* and *thadivila* for an extent of half an acre per head. As they were unable to pay up the balance amount, action was taken for the disposal of the lands in auction. The Member prayed that those lands might be registered in the names of the Pulayas free of *tharavila* and *thadivila* in accordance with the G. O. on the subject. In conclusion, the Member submitted the following suggestions :—

(1) Stringent orders should be issued to the effect that all lands applied for by Pulayas and Parayas should be registered in their names.

(2) Lands comprised in Survey Nos. 777/1 and 790/1 in the Rani *pakuthi*, Chengannur taluk, waste lands in Alapra, Valiakavu, Karinkulam, and Noorvakad and portions of the Kalaketty and the Pallode Reserved Forests, should be granted to them on registry so as to enable them to settle in colonies.

(3) Unregistered waste lands in the Manchadikara *pakuthi* of the Changanacherry taluk, Vadayar *pakuthi* in the Vaikom taluk and also in the Ettumanur taluk, which had been in the occupation of Pulayas and Parayas for the last 25 years, should be registered in their names.

(4) The rule requiring the removal of the tree-growth by the Forest Department before the land was brought under registry should be cancelled, as the registry-holders could be made to take care of the trees.

(5) A special officer should be appointed in each Revenue Division to attend to the registry of lands in the names of the members of the depressed classes and to render them the necessary help in the matter.

Devan's reply.—Noted.

16. Desirability of splitting the Peermade taluk into two taluks with Kanjirapalli as the head-quarters of one of them.

Mr. M. Thomman (Member, Peermade taluk) urged the desirability of partitioning the Peermade taluk into two with Kanjirapalli as the head-quarters of one of them. The six western *pakuthies* of the Peermade taluk, viz., Kanjirapalli North, Kanjirapalli South, Chirakadavu, Cheruvalli, Manimala and Poonjar might with advantage be separated and formed into a new taluk. The Peermade taluk was 629 square miles in extent and was larger than the Padmanabhapuram Division which comprised five taluks and had a total area of only 613 square miles. Since the partition of the Chengannur taluk into two, the Peermade taluk was the largest taluk in the State in point of area. The area of the proposed taluk would be 210 square miles, while 25 out of the 34 taluks in the State were less than 200 square miles in extent. The revenue of the Peermade taluk was increasing year after year, and, as large areas were brought under tea and rubber, it was bound to increase still further. The lease of the Erumeli and Paschima Devaswom lands also would contribute to a large increase in revenue. According to the Member, the revenue of the proposed taluk would be about Rs. 75,000, a little above that of the newly formed Pathanamthitta taluk. The want of a treasury at Kanjirapalli was also keenly felt, as the treasuries at Meenachil, Peermade, Kottayam and Changanachery were more than 20 miles distant from the six *pakuthies* referred to above. It was pointed out that, out of 40 persons entitled to vote under the Assembly Rules, 38 were in the six *pakuthies* under reference, of which only 2 were present at the taluk head-quarters on the date on which the votes were taken. The enormous increase in the revenue work of the Peermade Tahsildar and the accumulation of arrears in respect of *puduvai* and *pokkuvaravu* cases also necessitated the splitting up of the taluk into

two. The Member, therefore, prayed that the six western *pakuthies* mentioned above might be separated from the Peermade taluk and formed into a new taluk with Kanjirapalli as its head-quarters. The proposal would not result in any additional expenditure to Government, as, with the formation of a new taluk and the appointment of a Tahsildar with first class Magisterial powers, the First Class Magistrate's Court at Kanjirapalli and the Second Class Magistrate's Court at Mundakayam could be abolished. There was a fall in the file of the latter court, there being only 235 cases in 1094 as against 269 in 1092. Further, the cases related mainly to breaches of contracts and were more or less of a civil nature which required only summary disposal. If the accused admitted the offence, no witnesses had to be examined. The remaining cases mostly related to Forest and Excise offences. The total cost of establishment of the two Magistrate's courts mentioned above was Rs. 6,144 per annum, while that of the newly formed Pathanamthitta taluk was only Rs. 4,860 per annum. It was urged that the Kanjirapalli Munsiff's Court should be retained, as there was work enough for a full-time Munsiff. Further, the Poonjat *pakuthi* also, now under the jurisdiction of the Meenachil Munsiff's Court, might, with advantage to the people of that *pakuthi*, be transferred to that of the Kanjirapalli Munsiff's Court and its transfer would help the abolition of the Additional Munsiff's Court at Meenachil.

Dewan.—How far is Kanjirapalli from Poonjar?

Member.—Ten miles at the most.

As the proposal was profitable to Government and advantageous and convenient to the people of the six western *pakuthies*, the Member requested that it might be given effect to immediately.

Dewan's reply.—Government are convinced of the necessity for partitioning the Peermade taluk into two. The question will be considered.

17. Desirability of shifting the site acquired for the Mundakayam market to a spot within the town of Mundakayam.

Mr. J. R. Vincent (Member, Mundakayam Planters' Association) represented that the site already selected for the Mundakayam market was unsuitable, as it was situated right outside the town and about 2 miles away from it. The approach to it was either by a road two miles long or through a big river which was impassable during the monsoon. He requested that the market might be shifted to a much more desirable place and one within the precincts of the town itself, and suggested two sites suitable for the purpose.

Dewan.—Has no work been done on the site selected? I find that an estimate has been sanctioned.

The Member, continuing, said that nothing had been done. He pointed out that one of the two sites suggested was mostly an uncultivated and uninhabited piece of flat ground, situated in the heart of the town and with three approach roads which were cartable. All that had to be done by the P. W. D. was to fill in with earth the lower portion of the site. The land for the site proposed by him could be easily acquired on payment of compensation of about Rs. 1,500. That site was objected to on two grounds, *viz.*, that it was not large enough and that Government had sanctioned the sum for the site already selected. As to the first objection, the Member argued that the Trivandrum Market site, which was only half an acre in extent, was not quite as large as the site proposed and that an area of one and a half acres should be quite sufficient. As regards the second objection, he observed that the sum sanctioned would be sufficient except in regard to land acquisition. If the land could not be purchased cheaply, arrangements might be made for leases being taken from the present lessors and the annual rental to be paid could be easily raised in the way of fees for using the market. The Government